F445
.2
T2
1824

TO THE PEOPLE

OF

ILLINOIS.

THE following pieces are republished for the purpose of giving wider circulation to them, than could be done by any newspaper published in our state. The dispassionate manner in which the writers have considered the important and deeply interesting subject, and the ability with which they have conducted the argument, cannot fail to excite the attention of the readers. In addition to those articles which are treated in the argumentative way, there will be found in the "Report" which follows them, some authentic facts that must have weight with candid minds.

In the two first pieces, the reader will see that it is the interest of the people of Illinois to keep her doors shut against the admission of slaves, if any benefit is to be derived from emigration. These articles also shew that even if it were advisable to encourage a slave population, Illinois cannot reasonably expect to stand in competition with the large territory that has been recently opened for them, where the crops are such as yield greater profit to the slave holder, than the cultivation of bread-stuffs and provisions.

From the next succeeding article, the farmers of Illinois will discover, that should large slave holders be enticed hither, it would have an injurious effect on those who cultivate the soil by their own labor, not only by introducing a description of men amongst them who have no motive for honesty and industry, but by placing the industrious farmer in an inferior class of whites, and in competition with slaves.

The fourth number shews that if the people of Illinois should decide that a convention be called, they will place the power of altering the constitution into the hands of a small minority! that less than one-fourth of the voters can elect a majority of that convention in defiance of the other three-fourths.

The "Report" above mentioned shews from existing facts, the effect of slavery on the population, and the value of property. These effects cannot be denied. They are proved by actual experience, and the statement is made from official documents.

These considerations, it is thought, would of themselves be amply sufficient to convince the citizens of Illinois of the impolicy of calling a conven-

tion at this time. But there are others, some of which will be barely mentioned.

The finances of the state are in such a condition, that the expenses of a convention would impose a heavy burthen. Either a debt must be incurred, which would hang over the state for a long period, causing constant difficulties and adding yearly to the taxes, or a very heavy increase of taxation must at once be resorted to. In either case it would be greatly oppressive.

Let it be remembered, that the evils complained of under our present constitution, add but very little to the expenditure.

Banking companies, with small, or fictitious capitals, are sources of vexation and loss. By the present constitution no Banking institution, excepting a State Bank and its branches, can be established. Will the people of Illinois give the power of filling the state with petty banks into the hands of a body of men, composed for the most part of those who were instrumental in erecting the present State Bank with its attendant evils, and over whom they can have no control?

There is no way by which a convention could be *compelled* to submit the constitution they might frame, to the people for their acceptance or rejection. Whatever the convention should do, would be binding. Thus, ONE-FOURTH of the voters of Illinois might elect a convention who would have the power of making whatever constitution they should choose, and the remaining THREE-FOURTHS would be compelled to submit!

If taxes should be increased, if the state should be again flooded with a worthless currency in addition to that which has been thrown into circulation by the same party (with few exceptions) that now ask the convention—if the rights of citizens should be taken away or abridged, and finally, if SLAVERY should be introduced by ONE-FOURTH of the voters of Illinois—where then would be our Republicanism? How could it be said that the majority rule?

May 24, 1824.

NO. I.

The following considerations are submitted to the candid and reflecting part of the people of Illinois, under the belief that they are entitled to much weight in making up an opinion on the question now submitted to them, of calling a convention in order to authorize the admission of slavery amongst them. That such is the object of those generally who support the calling of a convention need no evidence to prove, other than that furnished by their own written and verbal declarations. The newspaper essays—the numerous toasts—and uniform declarations of those heretofore, and now most active on that side of the question, are proof so strong, that it would seem difficult either for ingenuity of argument, or boldness of assertion to countervail it.

To those who wish for slavery, then, as a means of increasing the population of the state, the following facts, taken from authentic sources, are addressed.

Within the limits of those states and territories in which organized governments exist, it will be found that there are 1,058,000 square miles of land.

Within the limits of those states and territories where slavery is tolerated there are 650,000 square miles.

Within the limits of those states and territories where slavery is not tolerated, there are 402,000 square miles.

Thus making the territorial extent within which slavery is permitted, exceed that in which it is prohibited, 254,000 square miles—certainly a very large difference.

Now let us see how these two sections of our country are populated:

Within the *slaveholding* states and territories, there were, in the the year 1820, as appears by the United States' census, 4,394,963 inhabitants; while there were at the same time within the *non-slaveholding* states, and Michigan territory, 5,175,080 inhabitants. Thus giving to the non-slaveholding section of our Union, including black and white on both sides, a majority of 780,117.

If then, we are to look to the old states for population to fill up ours, we must take into consideration those circumstances most likely to induce emigration. The first of these is the want of room, for the people to settle themselves in their native states. The *non-slaveholding* states, I have already shewn, occupy less, by one-third, of the extent of country occupied by the slaveholding states, and yet contain 780,117 more inhabitants. It must be evident, therefore, that a drain of population, for the want of room, must first commence from the non-slaveholding states.

But this result does not depend on mere theoretical principles. The history of the last twenty years proves it.

In the year 1800, Kentucky contained a population of 220,959. Ohio in the same year contained a population of 55,356. These states lie parallel with each other, and Kentucky always has claimed to be the most healthy state. They are also stated to contain 39,000 square miles of land each. With their equal advantages of climate (except that Kentucky claims to have the best) and their equal extent of country, let us see how they have mutually progressed in population.

I have shewn how they stood in 1800. In 1810, Kentucky had a population of 406,511. Ohio in the same year had 230,769.

In 1820, Kentucky had 564 317.

In the same year Ohio had 581,434.

Thus giving to Ohio in the space of twenty years an increase of 536,069. While Kentucky during the same period has increased but 343,358—making a difference in favor of Ohio of 192,711.

So far as it relates to these two states, this view must be conclusively against the slave policy, when adopted with a view to the advancement of population.

New-York, embracing a territory of 46,000 square miles, in 1820, contained a population of 586 050. Virginia, embracing a territory of 64,000 square miles, in the same year contained 886,129.

In 1820, New-York had 1,372,812—Virginia had in the same year 1,065,366.

Thus while New-York in 20 years has gained 786,762, much more than double her population, Virginia has gained but 179,217, less than one fourth.

But there is another example nearer to our own doors. In 1810, the state of Indiana, embracing a territory of 36,250 square miles, contained a population of 24,520. Missouri at the same time, embracing a territory of 60,000 square miles, contained 20,845.

In the year 1820, within ten years' time, Indiana had increased to 147,178—while Missouri had increased but to 66 586. These two states, it must be remembered, lie very nearly on the same parallels of latittude, and have therefore about the same climate; yet Indiana has increased her population to six times what it was in 1810, while Missouri has increased hers to but little more than three times what it was at that time.

The natural laws of emigration must render the *old free* states the source of population to us. Unacccustomed as their inhabitants are, and as they will continue to be, to slavery, they will not emigrate to slaveholding states, while there is room for them in states adopting a different policy. This is fully proven by experience. Introduce slavery here, and you thereby cut off the main source of our population.

When we look at the rapid progress that has been made in the population of the free states, upon a moment's reflection we must say, that it could not have resulted alone from the *natural* cause which produces that effect in old countries. On the contrary we have to admit that it has been, in a great degree the effect of emigration from foreign countries. But why is it that the great dif-

ference exists between the progress of population in the free and slave states? The answer is ready—emigrants from Europe, who never knew what *domestic* slavery was, have felt the same unwillingness to settle in the slave states that is felt by the same description of our own citizens. They therefore settle in the free states almost exclusively.

The principal part of the European emigration to this country, consists of men who have fled from the tyranny of their own governments—inspired with just notions of human liberty, they have preferred leaving their native country to submitting to the despotism of the laws under which they lived—such men as Messrs. Birkbeck and Flower, and those who came with them to this state, prove this assertion. They in the general therefore, are good and valuable citizens. Should the war that has just broken out in Europe continue to rage in that country, many of the disciples of freedom will take refuge in the United States. Artists of every description will emigrate, and we may expect a large share of skill and industry amongst them. But let us admit slavery, and the source of wealth, as well as of population will also be cut off. They will not settle amongst us. But both they, and the surplus population of the free states will go, so long as they can find room, to some other sections of our country where slavery does not exist. If what I have said be true, and I apprehend that it cannot be denied, it follows, that instead of increasing either our wealth or population by introducing slavery, that we shall diminish both.

These very brief hints are thrown out for public reflection. When I have leisure I may probably attempt to draw some further deductions from them, tending to the same result, that is, that slavery in this state cannot redound to its advancement either in *power* or *wealth*. LAOCOON.

NO. II.

In my former number I endeavored to show that the *territory* embraced within the limits of the slaveholding states and territories greatly exceeds that embraced within the limits of the non-slaveholding section of the Union; while on the contrary the *population* of the latter greatly exceeds that of the former. Having shown these two important *facts*, if they will not answer the purpose, argument would seem to be useless, to prove the absurdity of the proposition, "that it is necessary and right as an act of humanity to open our door to the reception of slaves in order to enable them to obtain a proper and comfortable subsistence:" An argument advanced by some and received by others, with apparent sincerity, as sound and well founded. When any argument is founded upon a supposed state of *facts*, unless the facts assumed be true, the argument is deceptive, and ought not to be relied on. The proposition then that we should open our doors to the slaves of the south, in order to afford them the means of subsistence, necessarily im-

plies that they are already too numerous to be able to obtain it within their present boundaries. Is this implication well founded? I think I shall show conclusively that it is not.

The state of New-York embracing a territory of 46 000 square miles contained in 1820 a population of 1,372,812. The territory of Arkansas (where slavery is tolerated) embraces a territory of 121,000 square miles, and contained in 1820 a population of but 14,246. The whole slave population of the United States is but 1,543,688: let Arkansas then be populated as New-York now is, and it will contain 3,613,266, considerably more than double the whole number of our slaves. Arkansas therefore is capable of receiving the whole slave population of the Union, and a still greater number of whites besides. But this is a small part of the unsettled country which is now open for the reception of slaves. Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Missouri and the territory of Florida together embrace a territory o 258,570 square miles, and contained in 1820 but a population of 454,758. If then we take Virginia with her present population, consisting of 1065,366, and embracing a territory of 64,000 square miles, as the standard by which to estimate the amount of population they are capable of receiving, they will maintain a population of 4,223,177, being 3,768,619 more than they contain at present; a number also considerably greater than double the present slave population of the whole Union. The proposition, therefore, that the slaves need a greater extent of territory, than is now open to their reception, for the purpose of obtaining the means of a comfortable subsistence, it seems to me entirely falls to the ground.

In exposing the fallacy of the proposition to which I have been attending, I feel myself naturally led to the examination of the *main* position assumed by the advocates of slavery, that is, that the admission of slavery will be the means of increasing our population and consequently of enhancing the value of property in the state. Knowing that abstract opinions, as well on points of policy as on most other subjects, are generally lost in individual interest, as are the rivers in the great ocean, this is therefore the fortress in which they entrench themselves, as most likely to resist the force of opposition.

Now let us see how this position will stand the test of *experience* and of reason. That the owners of slaves will take them to such parts of our country as will afford them the greatest reward for their labor, and that a southern climate is better adapted to that end, than a northern, are facts verified by the general experience throughout the United States.

But as it is my purpose, to demonstrate all the positions I assume, by facts wherever they can be found to exist, permit me to submit the following, taken from authentic sources, and therefore entitled to the highest degree of confidence.

In 1810, Mississippi, then connected with Alabama, contained but 3,489 slaves—while, in 1820, those two states contained 80,253.

In 1810, Louisiana contained 34,660, while in 1820, it contained 69.064.

In 1810, Tennessee contained 13,584, while in 1820 it contained 80.107.

These cases are sufficient to show the progress of slave population in the south.

In 1810, Missouri contained 3,011, and in 1820 had increased to but 10,222

If, then, the emigration of slavery has been so much more rapid heretofore to the new states to the south, than to Missouri in the north, and no reason can be offered to show the probability of a different result in future, it is fair to infer that such will continue to be the case until the wild lands of the south shall all be brought into cultivation; which from the capacity of the new states in that quarter to receive even more than double the present slave population of the Union, is not likely to happen for several generations. If then the toleration of slavery here, would not have the effect to bring any considerable share of that description of population amongst us, but would still have the effect of stopping in a great degree the emigration from the free states, it must follow that the proposed change in our policy, would neither increase our numbers, nor enhance the value of our property. For the latter result, being dependent on the former, if the first fail, the other must as a necessary consequence.

But the experience on this subject is not confined alone to the south. Pennsylvania, New-Jersey, New-York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Delaware, were all at one period slaveholding states. They are all comparatively near to the sea-board, and the expense of transporting the products of slave labor to a foreign market therefore comparatively small. These states, even when Europe was engaged in one convulsive struggle, and therefore afforded us the best possible markets for our surplus produce of every kind, owing partly to the unproductiveness of their labor, and partly to moral sentiment against the justice of slavery, provided for its abolition, and they are now almost entirely rid of it. Our climate is not materially different from that of a large portion of those states, and from the unalterable laws of nature, our products must be, in the main, similar to theirs. If slavery then has been proscribed from those states, both on the ground of morality and policy, does it not speak in language too distinct to be misunderstood, that it will not be beneficial to us? Does not the experience of those states teach us that if we even admit it *now*, we shall find it wise and politic to abolish it *hereafter?* If we consult the good of the *manu*, without listening to the misguided zeal of the *few*, I cannot doubt that under the Roman maxim, *Salus populi suprema est lex*—the will of a large majority must be against slavery.

LAOCOON.

NO. III.

Slavery is admitted to be a national and state evil, of no ordinary magnitude—an evil under which many of our sister states have long groaned, and from which they are destined to suffer rebellions that will waste their blood, and endanger their existence. On what principle is it, that we are to justify the planting so dangerous a foe in our own bosoms? No one, whose opinions are worth a serious examination, will venture to affirm, that it can add to the strength, wealth, grandeur, or happiness of a nation. These are always found to increase or diminish, in the same ratio that productive laborers increase or diminish in a state. There is always more productive laborers in a free, than in a slave state, of equal population; and where these are most prosperous, individual happiness is most universal. The labor of the free man is always more productive than the labor of the slave. The white laborer has an interest in his toil and in his reward. The rich have money, and want labor—the poor will furnish labor for the money. It is thus that active industry, and an accelerated circulation of money, always attendant upon it, is always exciting the mass of society in a free state to energy, enterprize, and improvement. It is thus that money takes its round of circulation through every ramification of community, and gladdens the hearts, and administers to the wants of each individual member in its circuits. Lands are parcelled out in small quantities, and cultivated by industrious farmers, who rear upon it more laborers to add to the nation's stock of strength an wealth; and the products of the earth are employed in administering to the wants of its inhabitants, and the surplus to the improvement of the country.

In the slave states the case is different. The wealthy, monopolize large tracts of country, and only cultivate so much as will pamper their pride, luxury and vice, and barely subsist their wretched negroes—the remainder lies waste. The labor of his miserable horde of blacks, does not contribute to the improvement or wealth of the country. In its improvement he feels but little interest. He is the chief of a petty principality, but little dependent on his neighbors. The lash goads from his slaves all that he deems necessary to his perverted appetites; and he cares for no more. To improve the condition of his poor neighbors, is a thought that but rarely enters his head. His vanity, his ambition are concerned to keep them in their degraded condition. The toil of his negroes is substitued by him for labor-saving machinery—for roads, bridges, canals, and literary institutions. He considers that toil a sure resource for all his wants. The consequence is, that this spirit keeps the indigent part of the white population in a condition but little above that of the slaves. Is it to purchase these blessings that many men in Illinois wish to see slavery extended among us?

But again, can slavery advance our individual interest? Can it increase our wealth or happiness, even for the present? Are the

inhabitants of Illinois in a condition to purchase hordes of negroes, and with them large tracts of country—make splendid improvements, and roll in luxury like petty princes? If this were so, there would be something splendid, in a selfish point of view, to gain, by hazarding so desperate a measure. But the fact is otherwise. A sweeping majority of us are poor, and have settled this new country to build our fortunes, and provide for the happiness of ourselves and posterity, Here our energies are not cramped by the deadly influence of negro capitalists; prospects of gain are equally measured by industry, prudence, economy, and enterprize. The road to honor and distinction, lies even and fair before us; the energies of our minds are untrammelled and unawed by the proud spirit of the wealthy nabob, who would sink us to a level with his blacks.

Could those men, who are too poor to buy a quarter section of land, or who require an eight-year credit to pay for a quarter section, buy slaves? Surely not. But we are told that slavery will raise the price of land. Is this true? Where does land command the highest price? In free states, according to all experience. The government has millions of acres to sell in Illinois, at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre. Is it likely that the slave-holder will leave these, and pay a high price for yours? A farm is too easily made in our prairies for that.

But it has been said it will bring money into our country. A very little reflection will satisfy us that this will not be the case. The most of the emigrants that we shall have from any quarter, will be those who are not doing well at home, and believe that their condition may be ameliorated by emigrating to a new country, but cannot be injured by it. Those who are happy and prosperous at home, very rarely feel disposed to remove. The great body of emigrants from slave and free states will consist of poor people, who will have ventured into this wild, to gather a little of this world's goods, and provide for their subsistence. The little wealth that a slave-holder can save from the wreck of his fortune, will consist of negroes. His cash and his movables will have been exhausted in making his peace with his creditors, and transporting his family hither. What little of property the non-slaveholding emigrant owns, will be converted into cash, and that little will come with him to this country. The emigrants from the east, and the non-slave-holding emigrants from the south, will bring us money and industry—the very things we want. Slave-holding emigrants, will bring us idleness, vanity, luxury, and the slow but fatal disease of slavery—the things we do not want.

Can a wise man, alive to his own interest, and to the happiness of posterity, to the permanent glory of this country, hesitate which side of this mighty question he will espouse? Can he shut out the flood of light that beams on the unalienable rights of violated nature, and his country's honor, from every quarter? Can he be so selfish and so blind to his own interest, as to conclude that the labor of one or two poor slaves, during a few fleeting years, will atone for the deep wound he will inflict on himself, his family, and his

country? Is this desperate game played to procure merely a nurse or an ostler? Is it for this that we so often hear repeated the sentiment, *let posterity take care of themselves—we have enough to do to take care of ourselves?* What would have been our condition this day, had our glorious forefathers reasoned and acted thus, at that trying period when our independence was declared and achieved? They could have paid a little tax for tea, and submitted to the laws of the Parliament of Great Britain, in which they were not represented, without any great inconvenience to themselves, and have enjoyed the blessings and sweets of peace at home, and left to posterity the herculean task of correcting national abuses. Had they consulted their own pitiful ease, and pecuniary interest, they would have done this. But they had nobler views; higher destinies awaited them; they had a nation to found; the violated rights of man to ransom from lawless oppression, and build a wall of brass about it, as a defence against invasion; they had their own honor to secure, and to transmit unsullied to posterity. These were the mighty objects they had in view. Their blood and their good swords paid the ransom, built the wall and founded the nation, and have left to us the sacred duty of preserving their achievements. Let us not betray the trust. ARISTIDES.

NO. IV.

I now propose to shew, first, That a large majority of the population of Illinois, would have a frightful minority of representation in convention. Secondly, that should the people of Illinois order a convention for other purposes, confiding in that convention, for the perpetual inhibition of slavery, it may so happen that a majority of that convention may elected by less than one fourth of the whole number of votes in the state; and that the majority so elected will, in all probability, be in favor of the extension of slavery. These propositions I mean to prove, by displaying a few facts to public view.

The best *data* for this purpose would be the precise number of voters in each county. This cannot now be obtained. In 1820 the census disclosed the number of voters in the 19 counties, into which the state was divided; but the general assembly having made 11 additional counties since that period, and population having increased much faster in some than in other counties, that census no longer furnishes data for correct calculation. I shall assume as the best attainable data, the whole number of votes given at the general election in 1822, for Congressman. It is true, that the number of votes given for member of Congress, does not shew the whole number of votes in the state; because each citizen entitled does not always vote; nor does every man who votes, always vote for a representative in Congress; but, as it is believed that the number in each county who are unable to attend at the polls

to give their votes, or who decline, through indifference, to exercise the right, bear nearly an equal proportion; it is conceived that the difference, if any exists, cannot materially vary the calculation. I shall assign to Pike and Fulton counties, the 85 disputed votes that the House of Representatives declared legal; and to Clark and Edgar 123 votes, which it is understood, were rejected for informality; and to Union, from which no returns were made, 400, although the whole number given for Governor, does not quite equal 400.

For the first point. A large majority of population, must be represented by a *minority* in convention. The whole number of votes given for member to Congress, at the last election, in all the counties, was 8.736—the half of the whole number is 4'368. The votes in all the counties stood thus. Pike and Fulton, 187; Sangamo, 512; Green and Morgan, 500; Madison, 711; Bond, 307; Fayette, 234; Montgomery, 112; St. Clair, 678; Monroe, 300; Edwards, 445; and Gallatin, 560; making in the aggregate 4.526, being 158 votes more than half of the whole number given in all the counties. These counties send 8 senators and 15 representatives to the general assembly, and would send but 23 members to the convention.

Alexander county gave 122 votes; Unio, 400; Jackson, 229; Randolph, 520; Washington, 259; Jefferson and Marion, 174; Hamilton, 231; Franklin, 243; Johnson, 147; Pope. 383; White, 519: Wayne, 207; Lawrence, 288; Crawford, 270; Clark and Edgar, 200; making in the aggregate, 4 210—158 votes less than half of the whole number given, and 316 less than was given by the first class of counties; and send 10 senators, and 21 represetatives to the general assembly; and with their 4210 votes, would send 31 members to the convention—a clear majority of 8 members over the counties giving a majority of votes. Thus it is proved, that a majority of the population of Illinois, as they will be represented in convention, will be inferior to the minority of population represented in the same body, as 23 is inferior to 31. Hence it appears more impossible for the people to be equally represented in convention, than for the minority of population to make negroes in despite of the majority.

The first proposition is thus established. Representation cannot be equal in convention. But before I take up the second, let us see this inequality of representation in a still more glaring degree.

Sangamo, Fulton, Pike, Morgan, Greene, Bond, Fayette, and Montgomery, at the last election, gave 1832 votes, and would have 8 members in the convention. Washington, Jackson, Franklin, Pope, Johnson, Alexander, Crawford, Clark, and Edgar, at the same election, gave 1851 votes, and would have 15 members in the convention—almost double. Let these facts speak for themselves.

It remains to be shewn that less than one-fourth of the population of Illinois. may elect a majority of the convention favorable to slavery. The convention if ordered before the next census, will

consist of 54 members—of that number 28 is a clear majority. Jackson and Washington, with 486 votes, will have in that body 4 members; Randolph 520 votes, 4 members; Union and Alexander, 522, 4 members; Crawford, Clark, and Edgar, 470, 4 members; Pope, 383, 3 members; White, 519, 4 members; Franklin and Johnson, 390, 3 members; Monroe, 300, 2 members; whole number of votes 3590; number of members in the convention, 28. A clear majority. 1795 is half of these votes. Then suppose these counties return slave members by bare majorities—a little more than 1795 votes, say 2000, may elect 28 members to the convention, who might rivet slavery upon us, notwithstanding the 6,736 other voters might every man vote against it. *Thus less than one-fourth of the whole number of votes* may carry just whatever measure they please, if the people indulge them with a convention. Let it be recollected that this disparity of representation, is in favor of the south, the very focus of slave principles, and the danger of a convention, at this time, is seen in all its peril.

What resistance could an equal number of votes, in another section of the state, oppose to these projects? Let us see. Sangamo, with 512 votes, would send 2 members; Green, Pike, Fulton and Morgan, 687, 5 members; Madison, 711, 4 members; Bond, Fayette, and Montgomery, 633, 3 members; St. Clair, 678, 4 members; Edwards, 445, 2 members; making in the aggregate 3,666 votes, and 18 members—majority against them 10 members. So that Gallatin, Hamilton, Jefferson, Marion, Wayne and Lawrence, with their 1450 votes, and 8 representatives, might fall in on either side, but could not alter the result.

In the teeth of these facts, gentlemen are found bold enough to tell us, that we should vote on the question of a convention, without any regard to the question of slavery; that the tissue of imperfections in the constitution call loudly for amendment; that the people in a convention, where less than one-fourth may be, and where less than half must be represented, will have a fair opportunity to inhibit slavery, if they choose; and so make a better constitution, and keep out slavery if they can. Yes, if they can. But once determine on a convention, and nothing short of a miracle can save them from slavery. These facts show a *particular* reason why these gentlemen pretend so much subserviency to the public will. They well know that if the people once consent to a convention, there will, afterwards, be no necessity for asking their consent to any thing. They know that the people's opposition to a convention, at the next election, is the people's armour; if they can once steal that armour, the conquest will be easy. The minority may then rule the majority. The love of power will make them hold fast to it.

If every man in the state was opposed to slavery, and all convinced that the constitution wanted amendment; yet no just man ought to urge a convention, until after the next census, and apportionment of representation. A constitution to be just should emanate from the people, equally represented in convention; they

would then be parties to it in equal degree. But we have seen that the people could not be equally represented in convention now, and could not therefore, be equal parties to it, because it would not be their act in equal degree; and therefore the eternal principles of justice revolt at the idea of a convention before the next apportionment of representation.

Are all the honest advocates for a convention aware of this fact? If they are not, let them give this number a full and fair examination. Let them examine their own bosoms for those principles of justice which I have mentioned, and see whether they do not there recognize their correctness. After the struggle is over, let it not be said, we were not apprised of this. ARISTIDES.

NO. V.

Extract from the Report of the Corresponding Secretary of the "Madison Association to oppose the introduction of Slavery into Illinois," at the meeting held December 27, 1823.

Believing that a correct knowledge of the actual effects of slavery on the population and wealth of a community, would be the best argument against its establishment in Illinois, independent of moral considerations, I have been desirous of procuring as much authentic information on the subject as was in my power. With this view I addressed letters to several intelligent gentlemen, residing in Pennsylvania, New-Jersey and Maryland, requesting their aid in ascertaining the value, as officially returned, of the real estate, in as large a portion of those and the adjacent states as would be conveniently embraced in their researches.

Sufficient time has not yet elapsed for the procurement and transmission of the facts which I have solicited. I have nevertheless to acknowledge the prompt and polite attention of Roberts Vaux, Esq. of Philadelphia, who immediately forwarded to me some essays, published in the Fredericktown Herald, containing statements which throw no small degree of light on the subject of my inquiries.

In the letter by which the papers were accompanied, Mr. Vaux says:

"Having read thy letter, I was reflecting as to the course which I should pursue to obtain the information desired, when three newspapers were delivered by the post-man, which I found to contain some essays illustrative of the evils of slavery, and exhibiting many of the facts and comparisons, which it is all important should be known to the people of Illinois. I therefore determined to forward the 'Fredericktown Herald' by the mail which conveys this letter. The writer of the articles in question I am unacquainted with, but he appears to be deeply interested and well informed on the subject of his appeal to his fellow citizens of Maryland. Testimony derived from such a source is entitled to the most serious attention: it is not the speculation of a theorist, but the determination of a judge-

ment, enlightened by observation, and evidently disciplined by experience."

Although I trust the nature of the information, and its immense importance, as connected with the question by which the citizens of Illinois are now agitated, are amply sufficient to ensure attention, yet I considered it not improper to give the testimony of a gentleman so distinguished as Mr. Vaux, as an additional motive.

In order to exhibit them as plainly, and yet as concisely as possible to the society, I have extracted the principal facts from the essays alluded to, and present them as follows:

The population of MARYLAND in 1790, was	319,728
In 1820 it was	407,350
Making an increase in 30 years, of	87,622
The population of VIRGINIA in 1790, was	747,600
In 1820,	1,065,113
Increase,	217,503
PENNSYLVANIA, in 1790, had a population of	434,373
In 1820, it amounted	1,049,459
Having increased in the same 30 years,	615,086

In the several counties of Maryland the same evidence of the evil effects of slavery is furnished. The counties in which the slaves are least numerous having increased in population, while those in which they abound more, have actually suffered a diminution. Charles county, having 9,845 slaves and 6,658 whites, has lost in ten years, 3,745 inhabitants, equal to about one-fifth of the whole number.

On property the effect of slavery is equally pernicious. The following table embraces the facts already stated, and shews also (from official returns) the comparative value and improvement of property, in the states above named:

States.	Acres.	Value in 1790.	Dwelling houses above $100 value.	Population in 1790.	Population in 1820.	Increase of the value of houses & lands from 1790 to 1814—15.
Md.	5,444,772	$21,634,004	16,932	319,723	407,350	74,118,348
Va.	40,458,644	59,976,860	27,693	747,600	1,065,113	94,383,072
Pa.	29,952,000	72,824,852	50,772	434,373	1,049,459	244,487,989

Thus, it appears that Virginia has something more than 40 mil-

lions of acres of land, which in 1799 was valued, with improvements, at nearly 60 millions of dollars; that the increase in value in 15 years was 94 millions of dollars; and that, for the accommodation of a little more than a million of inhabitants, she has 27,698 dwelling houses, worth above a hundred dollars; and that Pennsylvania has somewhat above 29 millions of acres, valued in 1799 at 72 millions of dollars, which in 15 years increased in value 244 millions; while her inhabitants (not quite so many as Virginia) are accommodated by 51,772 dwelling houses of the above description.

Again, it appears that the value of land in Virginia has advanced during the fifteen years above stated, on an average, two dollars and thirty-three cents per acre; while in Pennsylvania, during the same time, its average advance was eight dollars and sixteen cents per acre.

The essays from which I have taken the foregoing valuable information, contain many forcible and excellent remarks, which could not but have great weight with candid readers in Illinois. A diffusion of the whole, or at least the two first numbers, either in a tract, or through the medium of the newspapers, might have the happy tendency of removing the fallacious idea, indulged by some, that the establishment of slavery in this state, would enhance the value of their possessions.

I beg leave to present the comparative advance of the two great states of Virginia and Pennsylvania, in another point of view:

In 30 years Virginia advanced in population about 42½ per centum; and Pennsylvania in the same period about 141½ per centum.

The advance on the value of property in 16 years, was

In Virginia about 156 per cent.

In Pennsylvania about 338 per cent.

Thus, while one hundred dollars in Virginia was realizing an increase of one hundred and fifty-six dollars, the same sum in Pennsylvania yielded an increase of three hundred and thirty-eight dollars.

It is unnecessary to exhibit proofs or arguments to this Society, (and I conceive it would be equally unnecessary with any thinking man) in order to produce the conviction that the existence of slavery in one, and its non-existence in the other state, has caused the discrepancy which is here shewn between them in advancement. In the language of the essayist, "it is impossible to conceive what these great differences in improvement and value can be attributed to, but to the cause I have stated."

Indulging the hope that the citizens of Illinois will examine with attention and candor, the abundant evidence exhibited, of the evil effects of slavery, as well in a political and pecuniary, as in a moral point of view, I am encouraged to believe with confidence, that the result will be such as the benevolent members of this association desire.

THOMAS LIPPINCOTT,
Corresponding Secretary.

Extract from an Address delivered before the "St. Clair Society to oppose the introduction of Slavery into Illinois," July 4, 1823. By J. M. Peck.

In 1562 the British commenced the barbarous traffic. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Sir John Hawkins forced multitudes of the natives of Africa aboard his ships and sold them in the West Indies. It is recorded the Queen questioned the lawfulness of the trade from the first, and it was only the plausible pretext of *humanity* imposed upon her which procured the grant.

It is not a little remarkable that from the first introduction of slaves into the West Indies by the Spaniards, down to the present attack upon the freedom of Illinois, *humanity* has been the plea in justification. There is something in the very name of SLAVERY at which human nature recoils, and before a man can have the face to appear its advocate, he must impose upon the dictates of conscience in his own breast, and the revoltings of every good man, by the specious guise of *humanity*.

Doubtless Las Casas was actuated by real though mistaken views of humanity. He panted to relieve the Indians from their toils, and fully expected that his project would bring the degenerated sons of Africa to the possession of invaluable privileges. But subsequent events have shown his mistake. The infamous Hawkins cared nought for humanity or justice, but it was necessary to impose upon the good nature of Elizabeth and the English nation. When the subject of the abolition of the slave-trade was under discussion for twenty years in the British parliament, *humanity* was the constant plea for its continuance. The argument employed in Congress in favor of the Missouri question were a reiteration of the same plea, and now *humanity* is the "burden of the song" of the slave party in Illinois. From such humanity may the world soon be delivered!

Negro slavery was introduced into North America by the Dutch. In 1619, one of their Guinea ships touched at Jamestown, in Virginia, and a part of the unnatural cargo was purchased by the settlers. From this time all the commercial nations of Europe eagerly pursued the trade until 1807, when it was abolished on the part of the British, and the following year (the constitutional limitation having expired) it was prohibited by the United States. Now it has become the execration of the civilized world, as doubtless slavery itself will in less than a century from this time.

The Friends or Quakers appear to have the honor of the first religious people who stood forth in a body to protest against every species of cruelty and oppression. They commenced this noble career of benevolence from their first existence as a society, though multitudes of their members held slaves in Pennsylvania, New-Jersey and other states, in the first part of the eighteenth century, but in 1758 the society came to a final resolution to expel from membership such as should continue to hold their fellow creatures in bondage after gospel admonition against the unjust practice.

Had every religious society at that period adopted and rigidly enforced the same rule, slavery would have been extremely limited if not extinct in these United States. About that time many advocates for the oppressed slaves appeared, whose pious endeavors for their emancipation were blessed with considerable success, but since the revolutionary war the ardor for liberty which characterizes the age in which we live, has spread with unexampled rapidity. Where solitary individuals once wept over the suffering negroes, numerous societies are now established to befriend the enslaved and "let the oppressed go free," and unless the clamors of self-interest and mistaken policy can silence the groans of distress and obliterate the dictates of humanity, decisive measures must be adopted to abolish a system of cruelty and oppression, which has deeply stained the annals of three centuries with robbery and murder. From this brief sketch we may perceive that African slavery commenced in a system of injustice, oppression and hypocrisy. Its plea was humanity, but its motives were the basest and most diabolical that ever swayed the heart of man. Indeed the whole civilized world now unite in execrating a practice so direful as the slave-trade, for it is now pursued only by a set of outlaws, who are about to be hunted from the ocean by the combined fleets of Europe and America.